

REMARKS

Reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully requested. Claims 26-28 have been added. Claims 12-25 remain in this application as amended herein. Accordingly, claims 12-28 are submitted for the Examiner's consideration.

In the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 12-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yamagata (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,072) in view of Yeom (U.S. Patent No. 5,911,080). It is submitted, however, that the claims are patentably distinguishable over the references.

The Yamagata patent is concerned with controlling the input and output of an information terminal device when the remaining battery "quantity" of the information terminal device becomes less than or equal to a predetermined value. Yamagata shows, in Fig. 1, a stand-alone terminal device with a battery and a judging means that determines whether there is sufficient battery quantity remaining for operating a communication means *also located in the terminal device*, and if there is not sufficient battery quantity, the judging means prohibits operation of the communication means. Yamagata also shows, in Figs. 2, 3 and 5, a stand-alone information terminal having a CPU, input/output hardware, a battery that supplies electricity to the input/output hardware, and an operating system which checks the remaining battery quantity when a process using the input/output hardware is to be executed. The CPU obtains the energy consumption value of the input/output hardware, and estimates the time remaining for continuous battery operation and the time needed to complete the process. When the time of continuous battery operation is greater than or equal to the time needed to complete the process, the CPU permits processing. When the remaining operational time of the battery is less than

that needed to complete the process, the CPU attempts to change the process to consume less power. (See col. 1, lines 30-47; col. 2, line 66 to col. 3, line 31; and col. 9, line 40 to col. 10, line 64).

Thus, Yamagata describes that the electricity consumption values are retained in *the same terminal device* from which the electricity is drawn. Yamagata also describes that the input/output hardware that draws the battery power are part of *the same terminal device* that supplies the battery power. The patent does not suggest an *electronic device* that includes a register for storing a current consumption value indicating a requested current to be drawn *by the electronic device from a main unit* during execution of a function.

Further, the Examiner acknowledges that Yamagata fails to suggest a register for storing current consumption values but contends that Yeom does. The Yeom patent, however, is concerned with reducing the power consumption by an identification (ID) card reader while reading an ID card by activating an auxiliary power supply of the card reader instead of the main power supply. When a user inserts an ID card into a reader, the auxiliary power supply enables *the reading of a user ID* from the ID card so that the read ID data may be compared with stored ID data. If the read user ID data corresponds to the stored ID data, the main power supply is activated. Alternatively, if the read user ID data does not correspond to the stored ID data, the process is repeated until power to the ID card reader is turned off after a predetermined time interval. (See Figs. 3 and 5; and col. 4, lines 4-51). Yeom therefore describes a card that *stores only the user ID* and does not suggest a card that *stores current consumption values*. Further, Yeom does not suggest that the ID card reader stores current consumption values.

Neither Yamagata nor Yeom suggests:

a register having a region for storing a current consumption value indicating a requested current to be drawn by said electronic device from a main unit during execution of the at least one function

as called for in claim 12.

Moreover, Yamagata describes that the electricity consumption values stored *within the information terminal* remain within the *informational terminal*. The reference does not suggest an interface of an electronic device for *outputting current consumption values* for delivery to a main unit.

Additionally, the power is delivered *only within* the portable information terminal. Yamagata does not suggest an interface of an electronic device for *receiving* a driving current *from a main unit*.

Yeom, as noted above, is concerned only with the reading and verification of a *user ID* read from a card and does not suggest outputting a current consumption value to a main unit or receiving a driving current from a main unit.

Neither Yamagata nor Yeom suggests:

an interface configures for electrical connection to the main unit for outputting the current consumption value from said register for delivery to the main unit and for receiving a driving current from the main unit when the current consumption value does not exceed a maximum driving current for the main unit

as defined in claim 12.

It follows that neither Yamagata nor Yeom, whether taken alone or in combination, discloses or suggests the electronic device defined in claim 12, and claim 12 is patentably distinct and unobvious over the references.

Claim 13-17 depend from claim 12 and each further defines and limits the invention set out in the independent claim. It follows that each of claims 13-17 likewise defines a

combination that is patentably distinguishable over the references.

Additionally, regarding claim 15, neither Yamagata nor Yeom suggests an interface that *outputs* function enablement information from the register of the electronic device for delivery to a main unit.

Regarding independent claim 18, neither Yamagata nor Yeom, as noted above, suggests a unit having a reader for reading a current consumption value from a register in an electronic device. Further, neither Yamagata nor Yeom suggests a current consumption value that indicates a requested current *drawn by an electronic device from a unit* during execution of at least one function of the electronic device, as also described above.

Neither Yamagata nor Yeom suggests:

a first reader for reading a current consumption value from a register in the electronic device, the current consumption value indicating a requested current to be drawn by the electronic device from a supply unit of said unit during execution of at least one function of the electronic device

as recited in claim 18.

Also, as noted above, Yamagata describes supplying power *within the portable terminal* device but does not suggest supplying a driving current *to an electronic device* connected to the unit. Additionally, Yeom merely describes reading a user ID from a card and does not suggest supplying a driving current to the card.

Neither Yamagata nor Yeom suggests:

said supply unit for supplying a driving current to the electronic device when the current consumption value does not exceed a maximum driving current value

as recited in claim 18.

Therefore, neither Yamagata nor Yeom, whether alone or in combination, suggests the unit defined in claim 18.

Claims 19-21 depend from claim 18 and are distinguishable over the references at least for the same reasons.

Moreover, Yamagata does not suggest that the terminal device writes permission information *in the register of an electronic device*, and Yeom does not suggest that the card reader writes permission information in the ID card. Neither reference therefore suggests the writing unit defined in claim 19.

As to claim 21, Yamagata's portable terminal device does not write a current consumption value in the register *of an electronic device* that is connected to the portable terminal device, and Yeom's card reader does not write to the card reader. Neither reference suggests the claimed writing unit.

Claim 22 is directed to a system that includes a main unit and an electronic device and calls for limitations similar to those set out in claims 12 and 18. Therefore, claim 22 is patentably distinguishable over Yamagata and Yeom at least for the same reasons.

Claims 23-25 depend from claim 22 and are similarly distinguishable over the references.

Additionally, claim 23 includes limitations similar to those set out in claim 19 and is further distinguishable over the references for the same reasons, and claim 25 includes limitations similar to those set out in claim 21 and is likewise further distinguishable over the references.

Accordingly, the withdrawal of the rejections of claims 12-25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103 is respectfully requested.

New claim 26 depends from claim 12, new claim 27 depends from claim 18, and new claim 28 depends from claim 22,

and each is distinguishable over the references at least for the same reasons. Support for these new claims is found in Fig. 7 and in paragraphs [0042] and [0043] of the specification.

As it is believed that all of the rejections set forth in the Official Action have been fully met, favorable reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited.

If, however, for any reason the Examiner does not believe that such action can be taken at this time, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone applicant's attorney at (908) 654-5000 in order to overcome any additional objections which he might have.

If there are any additional charges in connection with this requested amendment, the Examiner is authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 12-1095 therefor.

Dated: December 16, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

By 

Lawrence E. Russ

Registration No.: 35,342

LERNER, DAVID, LITTENBERG,

KRUMHOLZ & MENTLIK, LLP

600 South Avenue West

Westfield, New Jersey 07090

(908) 654-5000

Attorney for Applicant

LD-447\